

Baxter 9225 '00 AUG 31 P5:13
28 August 2000

Dockets Management Branch (HFA-305)
Food and Drug Administration
5630 Fishers Lane
Rm 1061
Rockville, MD 20852

**Subject: Comments to Docket Number 00D-1318, Guidance for Industry,
Chronic Cutaneous Ulcer and Burn Wounds-Developing
Products for Treatment, June 28, FR Doc -00-16394)**

Dear Sir/Madam,

Baxter Healthcare Corporation, Hyland Immuno is submitting the following comments to the FDA in regards to the referenced draft guidance document.

Part II, Claims:

II.A, General Considerations, General comment: We believe that wound healing trajectories should be considered as an alternative endpoint for wound healing trials as discussed by Robson, M, et. al., Arch Surg, 2000; 135:773-777. As described in this paper, trajectories provide detailed information about agent effectiveness over the entire span of wound healing.

II A, General Considerations, Page 1, first paragraph of this section: The opening paragraph refers to claims of beneficial effects for separate types of wounds for which the product is intended. Safety data should also be addressed.

Footnote No. 2, page 1: We do not understand the meaning of footnote #2. Any product, medical device, drug, or biological that seeks an indication for wound healing, by definition would require clinical study in order to prove safety and efficacy of the product for that purpose.

II.B. Claims related to improved wound healing/1. Incidence of complete wound closure, page 2: We would like FDA to clarify how wound closure would be defined in skin graft/burn trials in this section.



28 August 2000

FDA, Dockets Management Branch

Subject: Draft Guidance Document on Wound Healing

Page 2

Cross-referencing page 14: The discussion of "standard of care considerations for burns" on page 14, although it mentions wound closure, does not define wound closure as it relates to skin grafts. This needs to be addressed.

II.C. Other Considerations Related to Improved Wound Care, Page 5, Section 2, Debridement: We would like to have a more clear and complete definition of what comprises "full and thorough" debridement for each indication that would be acceptable to FDA. Furthermore, how can new methods be validated without conducting clinical trials on such methods? Would FDA accept methods if they are validated by performing *in vitro* or animal studies? Please clarify. Would FDA accept a test validation method if it is described in a peer-reviewed journal article and, if so, we request that it be stated explicitly in the acceptance criteria?

Part III, Preclinical Considerations:

Page 5, first sentence of this section, at bottom of page: Add word in *italics*: This section consists of specific points to consider for wound indication drugs, devices, and biological products.

III.A. Animal Models for Wounds, page 6: Please include in this section an explicit statement that any new animal model is acceptable as a test method if the method is validated.

III.B. Biodistribution and Pharmacokinetic Studies, page 6, last sentence which begins "*Where feasible*": We would like to see an explanation of what situations would make it "feasible" to provide the type of data requested.

III.C. Toxicity Studies, page 7, paragraph 1, last sentence, delete as indicated: "Vehicle and sham controls should be employed where appropriate, to evaluate any adverse effects of product formulation components ~~on wound healing.~~"

Comment: The words "on wound healing" are deleted because an effectiveness evaluation is not appropriate in a toxicity evaluation of a product.

Information and data contained within this application which are marked as "confidential" are trade secrets or confidential business information of Baxter Healthcare Corporation and are exempt from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act pursuant to 5 U.S.C. §552 (b) (4) and 21 CFR Part 20.

BAXTER GLENDALE#66852

28 August 2000
FDA, Dockets Management Branch
Subject: Draft Guidance Document on Wound Healing
Page 3

Part IV. Clinical Trial Considerations:

IV. A. Absorption Studies, page 8: We are concerned about the potential to make accurate systemic measurements of the presence of a biologic substance or its degradation product (i.e. fibrin sealant) that has not been introduced intravenously. Attempts to measure the presence of such substances in wound bed tissue would require biopsy of tissue for analysis that would not likely be permitted by an IRB. Tests will have to be devised to distinguish one human fibrin from that of another human fibrin (i.e., fibrin sealant). Measurement of an incremental increase in the systemic circulating level of a biologic that already has a counterpart, such as fibrin sealant, will be impractical and probably immeasurable. In part, it must be considered that absorption by macrophages at the wound site will most likely account for primary removal of material from the wound bed. In addition, the ability to measure some quantity of fibrin sealant or its degradation product, and distinguish it from the fibrin formed by the patient and present in his/her serum, will also be impractical.

The guideline should distinguish between a drug substance which can elicit a biological response at concentrations significantly below their application level from a biologic which would be entirely masked by the presence of normally occurring analogous substances.

IV. C. Assessment/Quantification, Page 9, Paragraph 1, line 3: Add text in *italics*: "...if photographs are to be used for measurement and documentation, the lighting, distance/objective, and type of camera should be specified".

IV. C. Assessment/Quantification, Page 9, Paragraph 1, last line: Add the following sentences in *italics*: "Proposals for novel assessment systems should include validation data. With validation data in place, the data can be accepted. Examples of validation include the following [give examples]:

Comment: We are concerned about an assessment system being accepted toward licensure, and would like to see more examples of validated systems so that there is assurance that they support licensure.



28 August 2000

FDA, Dockets Management Branch

Subject: Draft Guidance Document on Wound Healing

Page 4

IV. C.2, Wound Size, Paragraph 1, line 6: Change wording to the italics: "For ulcers that extend deeply into tissue, depth ~~volume~~ or surface area should be measured when feasible."

Comment: We are concerned that there is really no way to accurately and quantitatively measure depth with a validated method. However, it would be even more difficult to measure volume. We do not believe that under sterile conditions the volume of an injury such as an ulcer can be assessed, and that depth is a more feasible and relevant measurement.

IV. C.2 Wound Size, Page 10, line 5: Change sentence wording to italics: "Validated test methods for determining burn depth do not exist currently, but biopsy and Doppler measurement of blood flow ~~are sometimes used~~ can be used."

IV. C.2, Wound Size, Page 10, Paragraph 1, line 7: Delete the last 2 sentences of paragraph 1 beginning "Wound depth heterogeneity is often an impediment to quantitative measures...ultimately grafted."

Comment: We would like to have a further understanding of the intent of these statements. Is the emphasis to distinguish between partial and full thickness wounds or is this meant to state a requirement for real measurement of each wound? The sentence addressing wound depth heterogeneity is not clear and restates what was already said in the previous sentences. The last sentence of the paragraph beginning with "Initial clinical assessment of full thickness wounds..." is not clear and requires qualification as to why this is to be done.

IV. D.1, Population, Chronic Cutaneous Ulcers, 11, 2nd paragraph at top of page: Please omit the last sentence beginning "However, if demonstration of efficacy is limited to ...may be similarly limited". This statement is not meaningful and is extremely limiting. This is because ulcers come in different shapes and sizes and the outcome cannot be limited to the size of the ulcer being tested.

Information and data contained within this application which are marked as "confidential" are trade secrets or confidential business information of Baxter Healthcare Corporation and are exempt from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act pursuant to 5 U.S.C. §552 (b) (4) and 21 CFR Part 20.

BAXTER GLENDALE#66852



28 August 2000
FDA, Dockets Management Branch
Subject: Draft Guidance Document on Wound Healing
Page 5

We appreciate your consideration of our comments. If there are any questions, please contact me at 818-507-5523.

Sincerely,

Arlene Vidor
Vice President, Global Regulatory Affairs
Wound Management

AV:sm

**AIRBORNE
EXPRESS.**

IF DESTINATION IS OUTSIDE OF THE UNITED STATES, THESE COMMODITIES, TECHNOLOGY OR SOFTWARE WERE EXPORTED FROM THE UNITED STATES IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE EXPORT ADMINISTRATION REGULATIONS. DIVERSION CONTRARY TO U.S. LAW PROHIBITED.

F R O M
BAXTER HEALTHCARE
HQ HYLAND
550 N BRAND BLVD
GLENDALE CA 91203
USA
SANDRA MORGAN 818-956-3200

61298033 473

Origin
FDX

These No.'s
MUST match

Shipment No.
61298033-473



Service

TO
FDA - DOCKETS MANAGEMENT BRANCH
HFA 305
5630 FISHERS LANE
ROCKVILLE MD 20852
USA
TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN
301 443 0035

Seq. No. 22

Weight 1-E
Billing Ref. 1001500478
Bill To I PC

MLDA 4X

Remember: Airborne Express cannot deliver without your airbill attached here.

United States Shipping

1. Complete applicable white sections of the U.S. Airbill. Sign and date the Airbill at the Sender's Signature line. Please press hard.
2. Peel off protective covering from back of Airbill.
3. Affix Airbill to envelope within dotted lines shown.
4. When using a Drop Box — follow special instructions on the Drop Box.

International Shipping

(Includes Canada & Puerto Rico)

To help ensure legibility of this multiple-part form, please type

1. Complete applicable sections of the International Express Airbill. Sign and date the Airbill at the Sender's Signature line.
2. Place Airbill and necessary documentation in plastic sleeve. Seal sleeve.
3. Peel off backing of plastic sleeve.
4. Affix plastic sleeve to envelope.
5. Retain bottom copy of Airbill for your files.

Limitation on Contents

The maximum acceptable contents of a Letter Express are 8-1/2 x 11 pages. If the gross weight of the contents, envelope or airbill exceeds 1/2 pound, the next higher rate will apply. Contents must be of a size and shape which fit the envelope and allow secure sealing without damage. Cash or cash equivalent should not be shipped. Items of high intrinsic value should not be shipped in Letter Express packaging.

Limitations of Liability

Liability of Airborne Express is limited on Letter Express to U.S.D., unless a higher value is declared for carriage on our Letter Express. The maximum declared value on the Letter Express is \$500.00. Airborne Express shall not be liable in any event for special, incidental or consequential damages, including but not limited to profits or income. Services are provided as defined in the current Airborne Express Service Guide (subject to change without notice). Copies are available upon request.

To reach your local CUSTOMER SERVICE CENTER call 1-800-AIRBORNE 11-200 017 000